

How to evaluate German unification?

Zapf, Wolfgang

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Zapf, W. (2000). *How to evaluate German unification?* (Veröffentlichung / Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Forschungsschwerpunkt Sozialer Wandel, Institutionen und Vermittlungsprozesse, Abteilung Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung, 00-404). Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH.
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-116371>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung *Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung* des
Forschungsschwerpunktes *Sozialer Wandel, Institutionen und Vermittlungsprozesse* des
Wissenschaftszentrums Berlin für Sozialforschung

ISSN 1615 - 7540

FS III 00 - 404

How to evaluate German unification?

Wolfgang Zapf

September 2000

Abteilung „Sozialstruktur und
Sozialberichterstattung“
im Forschungsschwerpunkt III

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB)
• Reichpietschufer 50 • D - 10785 Berlin
Telefon 030 - 25 491 - 0

Summary

The title of this contribution is a question with a double meaning: On the one hand it refers to the method, on the other hand it refers to the results of German unification. After a preview of recent evaluations we discuss comparisons of the Federal Republic and the GDR from the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s. Five asymmetries between the two German states are delineated: Size and population, economic strength, migration, travel and mass-communication, mass-exit and mass protest. Next we resume our theses of a stabilizing transformation, East German counter arguments and the most recent research results on living-conditions, political culture, convergences and divergences.

Contents

1	Evaluations of German Unification	3
2	Comparisons of East and West Germany in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s	4
3	Asymmetries between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic	6
4	"The stabilizing transformation?"	8
5	East German disagreements	9
6	German Welfare Survey 1998	10
7	Political culture research	12
8	Evaluations 1999: "The trend is right"	13
	Footnotes	15
	Bibliography	16

1 Evaluations of German Unification

The question of “How to evaluate German unification?” has a double meaning. On the one hand it refers to methods, on the other hand to results. At first sight the methodological question seems to be simple: it concerns the comparison of goals and results, gains and losses, assets and liabilities. But who defines the goals, which goals succeeded, and who evaluates the results in what context, that is as controversial as the basic theoretical positions in the social sciences engaged in the “unification discourse”. The comparisons also differ in their time and space perspectives. One can evaluate the unification from today, from 1989, i.e. the breakdown of communism, but also in a longer historical perspective. One can concentrate on the comparison East Germany versus West Germany, or on a broader international comparison, either on the post-communist transformation societies or including other cases of transformation, too. I shall focus on the comparison East Germany - West Germany, but I shall start with two longer-term comparisons GDR - Federal Republic. International comparisons are referred to only in passing.

Meanwhile, there have been published several reviews of transformation research. Let me emphasize two studies on the German discussion: Thomas Bulmahn (1996, 1997) and Rolf Reißig (1998). Bulmahn identifies eight “theses” which lean toward systems theories and six “theses” which lean toward action theories. Let me order both sets on a scale from negative to positive. The theses are oriented at system theory: new East-West cleavage, failed transfer of institutions, need of an own East German course, need of a “double modernization”, obstinate life-world. The second series of action theories: colonization and expropriation, missed reforms, voluntary simplification, unintended economic consequences of political action, uncontrollable process, but also a privileged special case. Most of these approaches result in a critical or negative evaluation of German unification. Bulmahn explains this by the ideological differences of the discussion and the restriction to the German case only. My own interpretation is that the basic achievements of German unification are underestimated: freedom, democracy, welfare development, and that losses and missed second-order goals (e.g. a new constitution, e.g. reforms of West German institutions and organizations) exaggerate the negative aspects of the evaluation.

From an East German perspective Reißig presents a different conclusion. He finds a majority of analyses preferring modernization theory which come to a positive evaluation and emphasize “transfer-, adaptation- and equalization processes”. Against this he demands an evolutionary, open, actor-oriented position which should be better suited to explain divergences from the predicted course and unexpected resistance.

Also controversial are evaluations from international comparisons. First, the “ready made state” thesis (Rose et al. 1995) declared the German transformation as a privileged special case. Meanwhile, we more often hear the opinion that a transformation path would have been better which first bought the load and later on the gains and which developed endogenous potentials instead of transferred institutions and personnel (Wiesenthal 1997, Diewald 1999). I don’t believe that in the German case we ever have had such a choice.

2 Comparisons of East and West Germany in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s

During the Cold War only few comparisons in social science literature have existed between the Federal Republic and the GDR if one neglects the Communist propaganda between 1968 and 1974 produced by Western Marxists (e.g. Jung et al. 1971).

From the 1960s I want to remind of Ralf Dahrendorf’s two final chapters in his book “Society and Democracy in Germany” (1965) where he presents a comparison between the two German states and where he is measuring both with his criteria of a liberal democracy.

Dahrendorf criticized the Federal Republic of the early 1960s because of her “authoritarianism of passivity”. He however agreed with her general development. He gave the GDR several points for modernity but regarded the Communist system as non-sustainable. The GDR had continued the destruction of pre-modern authoritarian traditions in many areas of life, a politics of equality was enforced, and lots of public discussions were organized from above. In this respect, the GDR is a modern society, but a “modern form with totalitarian content”. In the Federal Republic, on the contrary, some of the traditional structures were restored which the Nazi regime had oppressed. The big breakthrough, however, was the market rationality of an expansive economy. For the first time it brought for many people mobility and the dynamics of a modern society, even if concentrated on private wealth.

It is the charm of Dahrendorf’s chapters that he, in 1965, not only addressed the problem of German unification but that he also predicted some of its preconditions. He was convinced that a reunification could come from “within”, e.g. could not be enforced by the East Germans or West Germans. It can come about only by basic changes in the international system. But when it came, the totalitarian apparatus of the GDR would disappear. However, the established rationality of planning would not quickly pass away and would prove to be

different to the rationality of market and to the new privatism of the Federal Republic. The separation between West and East could be revoked but perhaps only in the long run, in a time span which equalled the time span of separation.

In my estimation this prediction is quite astonishing and refuses the assertions that sociologists had been unsuspecting concerning developments in East-West relations. It proved to be correct that the decisive forces towards unification came from changes of the international context. But East Germans, by mass exit, mass escape and mass protests, nevertheless have made an original contribution to the breakdown of the GDR regime. Extremely clairvoyant was the prediction that the approximation of the two German states would need a long time, perhaps as long as the separation, and that the accustomed rationality of planning will be resistant to Western market rationality for a longer period.

From the 1970s the “Materialien zum Bericht der Lage der Nation” (Data on the State of the Nation) of 1971, 1972 and 1974 were important politically as well as scientifically - as early German contributions to social reporting. The first three volumes, directed by Peter Ch. Ludz, were independent professional analyses although they supported the New Eastern Politics of the Social-Liberal Government. They draw on a meanwhile established concept in social reporting, namely on comparisons of areas of life, and are based on three principles: “Both German economic and societal systems are achievement-oriented; both economic systems are oriented at growth and modernization; both economic and societal systems are characterized by increasing importance of science, research, education and training” (1971: 34). The 1971 and 1972 reports try hard to be very neutral and not “to wipe away the deep political differences and political contradictions of the two German states” (1971: 35). They try to interpret “societal structures according to the relevant self-interpretations of the Federal Republic and the GDR.” “All analyses follow... the principle of immanent interpretations” (1971: 37). But one finds two pages on which the principle of immanence is suspended, namely on a list of comparative indicators on the pages 227/228. In 1968, the population of the GDR in relation to the Federal Republic is 28 to 100, completed housing is 15 to 100, expenditures for the social security are 16 to 100. In per capita data we find a labor productivity of 68 %, a net income of 64 %, a net income of pensioners of 44 %. Private cars are available 8 to 100, telephones 13 to 100. That means that the economic and social distance between the two German states in principle was acknowledged already in 1971, at the height of the New Eastern Politics. The volume of 1974 then abandoned the political reluctance: “The analysis comparing the two German societies in the volume of 1974 has emphasized more clearly as the former volumes the contrasts in the basic principles of the constitutional and economic order and the differences in the priorities in social policy of the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR” (p. XXX).

Only after a long intermission, Data on the State of the Nation were again published in 1987. They demonstrate that the East-West relation in Germany had not basically changed: “Ever more clearly the different economic systems prove to be decisive for the development

of the economic and social standards and the gaps of achievement between the Federal Republic and the GDR. It is not the lower personal achievement of our compatriots in the GDR which makes for this gap. But on the other hand the achievement of the social market economy of the Federal Republic cannot be taken as an isolated phenomenon. It has to be said instead that the degree of freedom in all areas of politics and society is a reason also for economic achievement" (1987: p. XXII). "The backwardness in productivity in the GDR for 1971 now can be estimated as 50 of 100; since then it has not decreased. The real backwardness in income at present is also 50 of 100" (p. 243).¹

From the GDR I do not know empirical East-West comparisons. On the contrary, in the inevitable entries "Federal Republic" in East German encyclopaedias the comparisons were in funny ways hidden. Example: "The BRD was (1973) in the production of private cars on third place, of trucks on sixth place within the capitalist world; around 47 % have been exported. Therefore, this branch is very much crises-prone (Meyer Neues Lexikon, 2. Auflage, Leipzig 1977, S. 173). Overall, this kind of literature is a mixture of ideological condemnation and selective information. At first, the condemnation was triumphalistic, 1988 eventually obstinately apologetic.

In my memory of regular trips to the GDR the information of GDR citizens about the Federal Republic was highly dissonant: on the one hand the official propaganda and the GDR media, on the other hand the Western media, the numerous visits to West Germany by pensioners and many visits from West German relatives. The citizens of the GDR were split according to their information about the West, and it is very improbable that this had no consequences for the unification process.

3 Asymmetries between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic

There are at least five important asymmetries (i.e. serious long-term inequalities) between the Federal Republic and the GDR; they have seriously influenced the process of unification and, thereby, also the process of transformation and the recent evaluations.

The first asymmetry is that the population of the old Federal Republic was four times larger than the population of the GDR, i.e. the proportion of the East German population is only 20 %. There is a famous chapter by Peter Blau, "Size and Number", which emphasizes such elementary facts for social structural analyses: "All minority groups, singly or in

combination, are more involved in intergroup relations with the group constituting a majority than the majority group is with them” (Blau 1977: p. 22). That is a basic social structural reason for the negligence perceived today by East Germans. During the Cold War and still during the Two-plus-four negotiations in 1990 these orders of magnitude did not play an important role, and the two German states seemed to be equal and occasionally also acted like equals.

The second asymmetry is that the economic potential of the Federal Republic was ten times bigger and per capita twice as big as that of the GDR. These facts were known at least since the 1971 report but the authors of the reports entangled themselves in contradictions. So we read in the 1974 volume: “The Federal Republic and the GDR belong to the circle of the ten most developed industrial countries of the world. They have top positions in their respective economic blocks” (p. 75). Seen from today this proposition is only right in its second part and it explains the influence which the GDR had in the Communist world.

The third asymmetry is that East-West migration since 1945 was by far higher than West-East migration. Until the building of the wall in 1961 the exit of mostly well-educated GDR citizens was overall three millions approximately. What we did not recognize similarly clearly was that even during the period of the wall, from 1961-89, another 400 thousand GDR citizens left the country. This emigration in 1990 was given even as a reason for reparation claims because it was regarded as “brain drain”. It is, however, unknown what part of the restitution claims for land and buildings is raised just from this segment of the population.

The fourth asymmetry can also be delineated from the “Blau theorem”. The attention of East Germans for West Germany was much higher than the reverse. Five million trips to West Germany in 1987 nearly equal one third of the GDR population; in comparison the percentage of West Germans which travelled to the GDR was only 10 % approximately. 32 % of West Germans but 84 % of East Germans report that they have relatives or friends in the other part of Germany (Noelle-Neumann/Köcher: 411). In 1992 only 38 % of West Germans but 71 % of East Germans have been longer than one week in the other part of the country. Quite evident also is the asymmetry in mass media consumption. West Germans nearly never did use television or radio of the GDR, whereas since the 1970s West German television was part of the GDR lifestyle.

The decisive asymmetry, finally, was the mass exit and the mass protest in fall of 1989. Albert Hirschman (1992) with great theoretical sensitivity has conceded that his theorem of exit and voice during this stage has been revised by real life itself. Namely, it has been proven that there is not only one alternative of protest: exit or voice, but also the multiplication of both processes which produce an enormous pressure for change. In my opinion this was the most important reason for the breakdown of the GDR.

4 “The stabilizing transformation?”

Our own evaluation² of the unification five years after the breakdown of the Communist system was the proposition of “the stabilizing transformation” (Zapf/Habich 1995). Compared to the long-prepared changes in Poland, Hungary or Czechoslovakia, the economic breakdown in East Germany was quite a shock. From 1990 until 1992 roughly one third of all jobs got lost (three million out of nine million), large parts of industry and former trade connections broke down. At the same time East Germans in their private lives reacted with a dramatic decline of marriages and births. It was a decline by more than 50 % which historically is without precedent. These experienced changes have been so drastic that it is an explanation problem of its own why there had been no more unrest and protests than the 20-25 % votes for the Post-Communist Party (PDS). The question is how a society can manage such huge changes in such a short time?

Regarding social structure, the GDR was credited, compared to the Federal Republic, with more equality for women and perhaps better basic education. As necessary adaptations after unification had been predicted “the removal of income levelling which impeded achievement, decentralization of political power, depolitization of status and qualification ascription, restauration of vertical mobility, more jobs in the service sector and reduction of overstaffing, reconstruction of a potent middle class and the end of the pressure of emigration” (Geißler 1992: 21). From the point of view of 1995, we could see that the rapid migration had stopped and stabilized on a lower level, that the shock-like reduction of jobs had ended and the employment structure had approximated West German patterns, but that all other processes developed more slowly than expected. The unforeseen demographic breakdowns had stopped, however, and there was even a slight turn in trend.

In 1995 we explained the coping with these big shocks in East Germany by several factors. Beside the breakdowns there were rapid processes to overcome the poverty economy: clear improvements in incomes for employees as well as for pensioners; big waves of catch-up consumption; clear improvements in infrastructure; clear improvements in social security, especially clearly increased pensions. The demographic breakdowns were only in part symptoms of crisis; they also were the expression of a freer life-course. The decline of jobs couldn't be stopped by economic policy, but it could be levelled by social policy measures (public work, further education, early retirement). At the level of private households we had adjustment processes in the way that the formerly large proportion of households with two full-time employees had decreased, but in 1995 it was still clearly higher than in West Germany. Households with two unemployed adults were the very exception. With our indicators of objective living conditions and subjective well-being we could demonstrate, overall, a clear improvement although the gap in comparison with West

Germany could still be observed. A list of critical life-events can demonstrate how much higher the speed of change was in East Germany than in West Germany, but also that East Germans in interviews reported more positive than negative life-events.

5 East German disagreements

Our thesis of the stabilizing transformation was met with disagreement especially by East German social scientists. Overall, the contributions of East German observers more and more claim that the problems of unification no longer stem from the conditions of the GDR but from the mode of unification itself.

Michael Thomas (1998) explicitly argues against the proposition that the transformation is basically completed: "The East German case of transformation today is rather at its beginning than at its end" (p. 115). The West German belief that the East German transformation should be especially favourable because of joining the Federal Republic and the high transfer payments is called unsuccessful because the seemingly ideal mode of transformation resulted in "an increasing social and cultural cleavage between East and West Germany" (p. 106). But also: "Beyond the German case, new openings and revitalization are developmental chances. They could be part of practical policies which would no longer follow the ideology of an ideal case but settle with realities" (ibid).

Michael Brie (1999: 229-232) concedes that the unification is more or less completed but he claims that the formation of an "East German split-society" would be structurally prevailing. Politics of a "self-sustained development of East German länder" and of co-operation of the imported elites with actors from the GDR in order to develop an "original East German elite" is becoming more important. The federal structure of the Federal Republic is a productive precondition for this and the actual three-party system in East Germany with a strong PDS (Party of Democratic Socialism) "is securing the new länder somewhat of a veto position..." (p. 231).

Even more outspoken - and over time more polemic - this position is represented by the Sozialreports, produced by the Sozialwissenschaftliches Forschungszentrum Berlin-Brandenburg. The Sozialreports were created within the Institute of Sociology and Social Policy of the Academy of Sciences of the GDR (not the least after our own model) and they are perhaps the most important East German contribution to social reporting. After prototypes in 1988 and 1989, which could not be published, immediately in spring of 1990 the first

Social report was published, the next ones in 1992, 1995, 1997 and 1999. Correspondingly to international standards they are structured according to areas of life and are full of competent information. Their political program can be found in the introductory chapters. In 1997, the concept of “Eastern identity” was introduced. It is said that Eastern identity is developing which can only be fully evaluated by people originating from East Germany. “Acceptance of Eastern identity in its productive meaning, in its critical adaptation of Western life conditions, is a necessary precondition for progressive reforms in the Federal Republic. Among the disastrous developments since 1990 there is the disregard in West Germany of the differentiated, and at the same time, complex interpretation of life in East Germany in past and present” (p. 58). The most recent edition of 1999 argues that the increasing Eastern identity is necessary as an opposition and has its cause in rising problems of integration between East Germany and West Germany. They can be found in four areas: structural integration, cultural integration, social and political integration, and identification. In all four areas not only deficits but obvious repression or exploitation by West Germans are observed. For example: “East Germany was integrated into the market economy but excluded from employment and property”. “In Europe, East Germans meanwhile are that section of the population which possesses the smallest part of the land on which it is living” (p. 21).

Although I estimate the Sozialreports as a source of information and early warning, I regard the theory of “ethnization” of East Germans and their identity as unacceptable. According to our data the differences within the East German population are more important than its common identity.

6 German Welfare Survey 1998

Our own analyses and evaluations are orientated at the concepts of modernization, level of living, and welfare development.³ Welfare development we measure by indicators of objective living conditions and subjective well-being. In addition, we describe a dimension “quality of society” (livability) which has objective as well as subjective components. On the objective side, these are e.g. labour market conditions and public security, on the subjective side people’s values and their trust, i.e. their evaluations of the institutions of democracy and market economy. We agree with the “Tiryakian criterion” (Tiryakian 1993: 12): “Processes of modernization involve short-term costs and sacrifices, whether material or manpower costs or both. Some of these will involve hardships on segments of the population and not all will benefit equally, but a general criterion for judging the success

of modernization is that a greater number of actors have better life chances, better opportunities to cope with environmental demands during or in the aftermath of a process of modernization than prior to its inception.”

In what follows, I summarize some results of our most recent Welfare Survey 1998 (cf. Habich/Noll/Zapf 1999) which are reported in detail in Datenreport 1999.⁴ Overall, the welfare balance of East German citizens is positive. In answering the question: “Since 1990 did your life conditions have rather improved, rather deteriorated, or is there no big difference?”, in 1993 48 % of the East Germans reported that their living conditions had improved, in 1998 it was 59 % and had significantly increased. The part of the population which perceives a deterioration has decreased from 23 to 16 %, and one out of four doesn’t see any difference. The majority of the West Germans is regarding its living conditions in 1993 like in 1998 as stable. But the remarkably high proportion of 31 % which in 1993 reported a deterioration has decreased to 21 % in 1998, and the proportion of those reporting an improvement has risen from 10 to 20 %. West German respondents, recently, are evaluating their living conditions more friendly than 1993. We can combine the information about how satisfied respondents in East and West are with different aspects of their living conditions and their life overall into a portrait of subjective well-being in Germany. Differences in satisfaction between East and West Germans are visible in several areas of life still 1998, but they have decreased. This means that the trend has continued which was already observed in the early 1990s. On a scale from 0 (completely dissatisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied) East Germans classify themselves on average in a set of 17 areas in 1998 only 0,4 points lower than the West Germans. In 1993 this difference was still 0,8 points. Average differences in satisfaction have been cut in half in the last five years.

Welfare development in West Germany is considerably different. In 1998, in most areas of life we observe a stagnation or decrease in satisfaction compared to 1993. This trend had been observed already in 1993 and it continues. The equalization of levels of satisfaction between East and West Germany, therefore, is brought about not only by positive developments in East Germany but also by the continued, even if slight, decrease of subjective well-being in West Germany.

Instructive is also how respondents from East and West Germany evaluate living conditions in the other part of the country, respectively, and in comparison with selected European countries. Obviously, East Germans idealize the level of living in West Germany which still is the reference for their own conditions - with an average of 8,2 on a scale from 0 to 10 whereas West Germans rank themselves at 7,7; that discrepancy is no longer as strong as in 1993. At the same time West Germans - differently from 1993 - evaluate East German living conditions with 6,1 points somewhat better than the East Germans themselves with 5,9. That means for East and West Germans alike that conditions of the “others” seem to be better than their own.

East and West German respondents, however, agree completely - with 7,8 points - on what level of living they “fairly” could demand. The gap between demand and reality in East Germany is with 1,1 points significantly bigger than in West Germany with 0,5 points. This is one reason for the still lower level of subjective well-being in East Germany although the differences have decreased.

7 Political culture research

In political sciences it is political culture research which is measuring quality of society to indicators with the acceptance of democracy. Fuchs et al. (1997) have operationalized that by the three dimensions “attitudes towards democracy”, “attitudes towards the welfare state”, and “attitudes towards institutions of interest mediation”. In the first two dimensions the evaluations of East Germans are much more negative than those of West Germans. In their explanation the authors rely more on the socialization hypothesis (values from the GDR area) than on the situation hypothesis (present deficits of integration), and their result is that the “inner unity” in Germany has not been realized. The reason is not that East Germans on principle are against democracy but that they have strong reservations against its present institutional setting, i.e. the democracy as realized in the Federal Republic.

In an outstanding chapter on “inner unity” Max Kaase (1999) first reminds us of the fact that in the old Federal Republic it has taken 20 years to establish democracy. Next he, too, refers to the asymmetry of unification and the different political cultures in East and West Germany, i.e. in the East a more egalitarian and plebiscitarian understanding of democracy. Finally, he is measuring “inner unity” by the perception of one self and the other ones. The perceptions of East Germans by West Germans have not changed very much between 1991 and 1996, but the perceptions of West Germans by East Germans have become significantly more negative. “In the area of general characterizations East Germans have significantly distanced themselves from West Germans ... even in 1999 the Federal Republic by far has not reached inner unity” (pp. 460, 465).

8 Evaluations 1999: "The trend is right"

What does remain then of our thesis of "the stabilizing transformation", confronted by East German blames of colonization and West German diagnoses of deficits of inner unity? As already said in the beginning, we regard modernization and welfare development as the most important dimensions for an evaluation of unification. In evaluating welfare development we recently have given more importance to the quality of society than five years after the breakdown of Communism, because questions of identity, of trust in democracy and of mutual acceptance earlier played a minor role compared to material living conditions and personal well-being. In general, our conclusion is: "The difference in objective living conditions is nearly eliminated; with regard to the subjective well-being the positive trend cannot be disputed although there are clear gaps; the perception and evaluation of the common society, however, is quite divergent" (Habich 1999: 7). For an explanation of the discrepancy between individual welfare and evaluation of society as well as for the prediction of further development we propose the following arguments.

The remaining differences in objective living conditions are decreasing significantly more slowly than in the first years after 1989. "Rising expectations" relatively reduce the achievements and produce new aspirations (e.g. after the equalization of income now the aspiration towards the equalization of property as it was accumulated in West Germany over 50 years). According to the "Tocqueville-Paradox", sensitivity for remaining inequalities is rising just during a period of reduction of differences. Roland Habich (*ibid.*) who makes these points is regarding this paradox as operating in the long term but not as a principal challenge to integration.

Freedom, security and justice are basic dimensions of a livable society but not the only ones. The high level of welfare, e.g., has a compensating effect. Accordingly, also the majority of East German respondents holds: "In a country like Germany, all in all, one can live very well."⁵ At the same time, they report significant deficits in security and justice. Thomas Bulmahn (1999), on the one hand, argues against scandalization of those problems, on the other hand against underestimation, and he recommends to take into account explicitly experiences and expectations (disappointments of expectations) beside factors of socialization and situation.

These findings are confirmed and differentiated by an analysis of determinants of satisfaction with standard of living, democracy and distributive justice (Delhey/Böhnke 1999). In none of these three problem areas the East-West-variable (East Germans) has significant explanatory power. But because the significant variables (welfare positions, perceived difference of living conditions in East and West, perceived conflicts between East and West, party preference) have very different values in East Germany and West Germany,

even with a further equalization of material living conditions the expectation of identical satisfaction and evaluation is unrealistic. This does not mean, however, that the “ideal of nearly equal living conditions” (p. 36) is queried.

My personal evaluation of German reunification is, in analogy to Winston Churchill’s famous dictum on democracy: “Among the many uncertain possibilities of the unification process the achieved result is the least negative one.” Therefore I have emphasized, beside the discussion of recent opinion research, the long-term retrospective. In addition, I want to refer for my judgement to a central actor and contemporary witness of the unification process, namely the first and last freely-elected Prime Minister of the GDR, Lothar de Maizière. In a book of 1995, “Advocate of unification”, de Maizière has regarded unification as a success, not with standing several critical objections. In a lecture in fall of 1999, he also confirms an overall positive balance. He argues that the complicated treaties have enabled a “soft transition” compared, e.g., to the partly illegal and chaotic conditions in Eastern Europe, especially in Russia. Two big mistakes are heavy burdens still today: on the one hand the underestimation of the necessary achievements of education and learning, on the other hand the overestimation of the coping capacities of people. Overall, however, unification is better than its reported reputation. The trend is right. Most important should be the search and will for a common future.

Footnotes

- 1 The book which could be reviewed next, "Federal Republic - GDR", was edited by W. Weidenfeld and H. Zimmermann (1989) at the fortieth birthday of the both German states. For central topics and areas of life it presents separate analyses of the Federal Republic and the GDR. All West German authors who have written those chapters are very informative, also in the chapters on the GDR, but no one had any idea of the events in fall of 1989, myself included.
- 2 The plural refers to publications of the unit "Social structure and social reporting" at the Science Center of Berlin; especially to Zapf/Habich 1995; Zapf/Habich (eds.) 1996; Habich 1999a; and to the most recent contributions, mentioned in section 8: Habich 1999b; Bulmahn 1999, Delhey/Böhnke 1999.
- 3 The same perspective is taken in publications of the Social Indicators section and the Social Inequality section of the German Sociological Association, e.g. Glatzer 1996, Hauser 1996, Hradil 1996, Geißler 1992, 1996. Pretentious programs of longitudinal analyses are carried on by the research group Socio-economic Panel (G. Wagner, P. Krause, J. Schupp) at the Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, and by the group Life-course analyses at the Max-Planck-Institute in Berlin (K. U. Mayer, M. Diewald, H. Solga).
- 4 The Welfare Surveys were fielded 1978, 1980, 1984 and 1988 at Mannheim University, and afterwards at the Science Center Berlin in co-operation with the Survey Research Center, Mannheim: 1990 (only in East Germany), 1993 and 1998. These are representative surveys of the population over 18, 2000 to 3000 cases. For details cf. Habich/Zapf 1994. Datenreport was created 1983 by the German Statistical Office as kind of a popular biannual edition of the Statistical Yearbook. From 1985 through 1999 social scientists have contributed part II: "Objective living conditions and Subjective well-being", in recent years under the direction of R. Habich and H.-H. Noll.
- 5 The complete question reads: "And how much do you agree with this statement: Overall, one can live very well in a country like Germany. Do you agree with this statement fully, rather, rather not, not at all, don't know".

Bibliography

- Blau, Peter M. (1977): *Inequality and Heterogeneity. A Primitive Theory of Social Structure*. New York: Free Press
- Brie, Michael (1999): Die ostdeutsche Teilgesellschaft. In: Kaase, Max/Schmid, Günther (eds.): *Eine lernende Demokratie. WZB-Jahrbuch 1999*. Berlin: sigma, pp. 201-236.
- Bulmahn, Thomas (1996; 1997): Vereinigungsbilanzen. Die deutsche Einheit im Spiegel der Sozialwissenschaften. WZB-paper, FS III 96-403; reprint in: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament*, B 40-41/97, pp. 29-37.
- Bulmahn, Thomas (1999): Freiheit, Wohlstand, Sicherheit und Gerechtigkeit. Attribute einer lebenswerten Gesellschaft. WZB-paper, FS III 99-411, Berlin.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf (1965): *Gesellschaft und Demokratie in Deutschland*. München: Piper
- Datenreport 1999. Zahlen und Fakten über die Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Statistisches Bundesamt in Zusammenarbeit mit den Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung und dem Zentrum für Umfragen, Methoden und Analysen, Mannheim. Part II: Objektive Lebensbedingungen und subjektives Wohlbefinden im vereinten Deutschland (edited by Roland Habich und Heinz-Herbert Noll). Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Bonn 1999, pp. 413-612.
- Delhey, Jan/Böhnke, Petra (1999): Über die materielle zur inneren Einheit? Wohlstandslagen und subjektives Wohlbefinden in Ost und West. WZB-paper FS III 99-412. Berlin.
- Diewald, Martin/Mach, Bogdan W. (1999): Market Transition, Institutions, and the Restructuring of Earnings: East Germany and Poland During the First Five Years of Transformation Process. Max-Planck-Institut für Bildungsforschung Berlin, Working paper No. 2.
- Fuchs, Dieter/Roller, Edeltraud/Weßels, Bernhard (1997): Die Akzeptanz der Demokratie des vereinigten Deutschlands. Oder: Wann ist ein Unterschied ein Unterschied? *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament*, B 51/97, pp. 3-12.
- Geißler, Rainer (1992): *Die Sozialstruktur Deutschlands*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. Second edition 1996.
- Habich, Roland (1999a): Lebensbedingungen. In: Weidenfeld, Werner/Korte, Karl-Rudolf (eds.): *Handbuch zur Deutschen Einheit 1949-1989-1999*. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Bonn. pp. 523-538.
- Habich, Roland/Noll, Heinz-Herbert/Zapf, Wolfgang (1999): Subjektives Wohlbefinden in Ostdeutschland nähert sich westdeutschem Niveau. Ergebnisse des Wohlfahrtssurveys 1998. Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren (ISI), 22, pp. 1-6.
- Habich, Roland/Zapf, Wolfgang (1994): Gesellschaftliche Dauerbeobachtung - Wohlfahrtssurveys: Instrument der Sozialberichterstattung. In: Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, Mikroanalytische Grundlagen der Gesellschaftspolitik. Ergebnisse aus dem gleichnamigen Sonderforschungsbereich an den Universitäten Frankfurt/Mannheim. Volume 2, pp. 13-37. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag
- Hauser, Richard/Glatzer, Wolfgang/Hradil, Stefan u.a. (eds.) (1996): *Ungleichheit und Sozialpolitik*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1992): Abwanderung, Widerspruch und das Schicksal der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. *Leviathan*, 3, pp. 330-358.
- Jung, H./Deppe, F. et al. (1971): *BRD-DDR. Vergleich der Gesellschaftssysteme*. Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein

- Kaase, Max (1999): Innere Einheit. In: Weidenfeld, Werner/Korte, Karl-Rudolf (eds.): Handbuch zur Deutschen Einheit 1949-1989-1999. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Bonn 1999, pp. 554-564.
- Krause, Peter, Roland Habich, „Einkommen und Lebensqualität im vereinigten Deutschland“, Vierteljahresshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, Heft 2, 69. Jahrgang, 2000, S. 317-340
- Lutz, Burkart u.a. (1996): Arbeit, Arbeitsmarkt und Betriebe. Leske + Budrich 1996
- Maizière, de Lothar (1996): Anwalt der Einheit. Berlin: Argon, (in French: 1995).
- Materialien zum Bericht zur Lage der Nation: Bundesminister für innerdeutsche Beziehungen, Bonn 1971; dito 1972; 1974: Materialien zum Bericht zur Lage der Nation im geteilten Deutschland, Bonn 1987: Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen..
- Meyers Neues Lexikon (1977), second edition 1977. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Noelle-Neumann, Elisabeth/Köcher, Renate (1993): Allensbacher Jahrbuch der Demoskopie 1992-1994. München: K. G. Sauer
- Reißig, Rolf (1998): Transformationsforschung. Gewinne, Desiderate, Perspektiven. Politische Vierteljahresschrift, 39, pp. 301-328.
- Rose, Richard/Zapf, Wolfgang/Seifert, Wolfgang (1993): Germans in Comparative Perspective. Studies in Public Policy, No. 218. Glasgow: Centre for the Study of Public Policy
- Sozialreport '90. Institut für Soziologie und Sozialpolitik der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Berlin 1990, ed. by Gunnar Winkler et al.
- Sozialreport '92. Sozialwissenschaftliches Forschungszentrum Berlin-Brandenburg, Berlin 1992; dito: 1995, 1997, 1999, ed. by Gunnar Winkler et al.
- Thomas, Michael (1998): Paradoxien der deutschen Transformationsdebatte. Berliner Debatte Initial, Volume 9, No. 2/3, pp. 104-116.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. (1993): Modernization in the Millenarian Decade: Lessons for and from Eastern Europe. Paper Università degli Studi di Trento.
- Weidenfeld, Werner/Zimmermann, Hartmut (eds.)(1989): Deutschland - Handbuch. Eine doppelte Bilanz 1949-1989. Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Bonn.
- Wiesenthal, Helmut (1996): Die neuen Bundesländer als Sonderfall der Transformation in den Ländern Ost-Mitteleuropas. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament, B 40, pp. 46-54.
- Zapf, Wolfgang/Habich Roland (1995): Die sich stabilisierende Transformation - ein deutscher Sonderweg? In: Hedwig Rudolph (ed.), Geplanter Wandel - ungeplante Wirkungen, WZB-Jahrbuch 1995. Berlin: sigma. pp. 194-159.
- Zapf, Wolfgang/Habich, Roland (eds.) (1996): Wohlfahrtsentwicklung im vereinten Deutschland. Sozialstruktur, Sozialer Wandel und Lebensqualität. Berlin: sigma
- Zapf, Wolfgang/Habich, Roland (1999): Die Wohlfahrtsentwicklung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1949-1999. In: Kaase, Max/Schmid, Günther (eds.): Eine lernende Demokratie. WZB-Jahrbuch 1999. Berlin: sigma, pp. 285-314.

Abteilung „Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung“

- früher: Arbeitsgruppe „Sozialberichterstattung“

Die Abteilung *Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung* hat einen grundlagenwissenschaftlichen Schwerpunkt in der Analyse des sozialstrukturellen Wandels moderner Gesellschaften und einen anwendungsorientierten Schwerpunkt in der Sozialberichterstattung; die Forschungsaufgaben liegen in der Dauerbeobachtung des sozialstrukturellen Wandels und der Wohlfahrtsentwicklung. Die theoretischen Orientierungen stammen aus der Modernisierungstheorie und der Theorie der Wohlfahrtsproduktion.

MitarbeiterInnen in der Abteilung „Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung“

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Zapf (Leiter)
Dr. Roland Habich (Koordinator)

Petra Böhnke, Diplomsoziologin
Thomas Bulmahn, Diplomsoziologe
Dr. Jan Delhey
Dr. Katrin Gillwald

Dr. Wilhelm Hinrichs
Dr. sc. Eckhard Priller
Annett Schultz, Diplomsoziologin

Bitte senden Sie mir die folgenden Veröffentlichungen zu
Pro paper bitte **1 DM-Briefmarke** beilegen

- Bitte einen beschrifteten Adressenaufkleber beilegen •

WZB

WISSENSCHAFTSZENTRUM BERLIN
FÜR SOZIALFORSCHUNG

Paper-Nr., Autor

Name

Institution

Straße

Ort

Datum /
Unterschrift

Bestellung bitte einsenden an:

WZB • Abt. Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung • Reichpietschufer 50 • D - 10785 Berlin

Forschungsschwerpunkt III "Sozialer Wandel, Institutionen und Vermittlungsprozesse"

Auswahl der Arbeitspapiere (Stand: September 2000)

Abteilungsübergreifend

- FS III 96-301 The Mass Media and Modern Government
Kenneth Newton
- FS III 96-302 Das intermediäre System der Politik als Orientierungssystem der Bürger
Dieter Fuchs, Edeltraud Roller, Dieter Rucht und Bernhard Weßels

Abteilung 1 "Öffentlichkeit und soziale Bewegungen"

- FS III 90-101 Strukturen und Funktionen moderner Öffentlichkeit. Fragestellungen und Ansätze.
Jürgen Gerhards und Friedhelm Neidhardt
- FS III 92-101 Anbieter von öffentlichen politischen Veranstaltungen in West-Berlin.
Barbara Blattert
Nachfrager und wahrgenommenes Angebot von öffentlichen politischen Veranstaltungen in der Bundesrepublik.
Jürgen Gerhards
- FS III 92-103 Dokumentation und Analyse von Protestereignissen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Prodat), Codebuch.
Dieter Rucht, Peter Hocke und Thomas Ohlemacher
- FS III 93-101 Westeuropäische Integration und die Schwierigkeiten der Entstehung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit.
Jürgen Gerhards
- FS III 93-102 Selbstkontrolle in den Medien: Der Deutsche Presserat und seine Möglichkeiten.
Jessica Eisermann
- FS III 93-103 Prominenz in der Bundesrepublik.
Birgit Peters
- FS III 94-101 Von den Oppositionsgruppen der DDR zu den neuen sozialen Bewegungen in Ostdeutschland?
Barbara Blattert, Dieter Rink und Dieter Rucht
- FS III 95-101 A Burning Question: Explaining the Rise of Racist and Extreme Right Violence in Western Europe.
Ruud Koopmans
- FS III 95-103 German Unification, Democratization and the Role of Social Movements: A Missed Opportunity.
Dieter Rucht
- FS III 95-105 Diskursanalyse im Zeit- und Ländervergleich. Methodenbericht über eine systematische Inhaltsanalyse zur Erfassung des öffentlichen Diskurses über Abtreibung in den USA und der Bundesrepublik in der Zeit von 1970 bis 1994.
Jürgen Gerhards und Monika Lindgens
- FS III 97-101 Citizenship, National Identity and the Mobilisation of the Extreme Right. A Comparison of France, Germany, the Netherlands and Switzerland
Ruud Koopmans and Hanspeter Kriesi

- FS III 98-101 Proteststrukturen im Ost-West-Vergleich 1989 - 1992
Susann Burchardt
- FS III 98-103 Die Branchenstruktur der Markt- und Meinungsforschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1986 bis 1996. Eine deskriptive Analyse
Simone Wack
- FS III 98-104 Konjunkturen der NS-Bewegung. Eine Untersuchung der Veranstaltungsaktivitäten der Münchener NSDAP, 1925-1930
Helmut K. Anheier, Friedhelm Neidhardt und Wolfgang Vorkamp
- FS III 98-105 Challenging the Liberal Nation-State? Postnationalism, Multiculturalism, and the Collective Claims-Making of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Britain and Germany
Ruud Koopmans and Paul Statham
- FS III 98-106 Die Stimme der Medien im politischen Prozeß – Themen und Meinungen in Pressekommentaren
Friedhelm Neidhardt, Christiane Eilders und Barbara Pfetsch
- FS III 98-107 Methodenbericht zum Projekt: Die Stimme der Medien im politischen Prozeß – Themen und Meinungen in Pressekommentaren
Christiane Eilders und Albrecht Lüter
- FS III 99-101 Government News Management - Strategic Communication in Comparative Perspective
Barbara Pfetsch
- FS III 99-102 (Re)constructing Community in Berlin; Of Jews, Turks and German Responsibility
Jonathan Laurence
- FS III 99-103 "In Russia we were Germans, and now we are Russians." - Dilemmas of Identity Formation and Communication among German-Russian Aussiedler
Barbara Pfetsch

Abteilung 2 "Institutionen und sozialer Wandel"

- FS III 91-201 Ein analytisches Schema zur Klassifikation von Politikgehalten.
Edeltraud Roller
- FS III 93-202 Eine Metatheorie des demokratischen Prozesses.
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 93-203 A Metatheory of the Democratic Process.
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 93-205 Mass Media: Political Independence of Press and Broadcasting Systems.
Katrin Voltmer
- FS III 94-201 Democratic Transformation and the Prerequisites of Democratic Opposition in East and Central Europe.
Bernhard Wessels und Hans-Dieter Klingemann
- FS III 94-202 Cultural Conditions of the Transformation to Liberal Democracies in Central and Eastern Europe.
Dieter Fuchs und Edeltraud Roller
- FS III 94-206 The Evolution of Western Foreign Aid Programs.
Thomas R. Cusack und Joyce P. Kaufman
- FS III 96-201 Political Science: The Discipline.
Robert E. Goodin und Hans-Dieter Klingemann

- FS III 96-202 Contexts of Political Protest in Western Democracies: Political Organization and Modernity.
Edeltraud Roller und Bernhard Wessels
- FS III 96-203 Problemreich und konfliktgeladen: Lokale Demokratie in Deutschland fünf Jahre nach der Vereinigung.
Thomas R. Cusack und Bernhard Weßels
- FS III 96-204 Social Alliances and Coalitions: The Organizational Underpinnings of Democracy in West Germany.
Bernhard Wessels
- FS III 96-205 Abbau des Sozialstaats. Einstellungen der Bundesbürger zu Kürzungen von Sozialleistungen in den neunziger Jahren.
Edeltraud Roller
- FS III 96-206 System Characteristics Matter: Empirical Evidence from Ten Representation Studies.
Bernhard Wessels
- FS III 96-207 Wohin geht der Wandel der demokratischen Institutionen in Deutschland? Die Entwicklung der Demokratievorstellungen der Deutschen seit ihrer Vereinigung.
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 96-208 Legislative Recruitment in Germany: Professionalization or Political Class?
Bernhard Wessels
- FS III 97-201 Social Capital, Institutional Structures, and Democratic Performance: A Comparative Study of German Local Governments.
Thomas R. Cusack
- FS III 97-202 The Electoral Process in the Unified Germany.
Dieter Fuchs und Robert Rohrschneider
- FS III 97-203 Kriterien demokratischer Performanz in Liberalen Demokratien
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 98-201 Vom Konsens zum Dissens? Politische Ordnungspräferenzen von Eliten und Bürgern im ost-westdeutschen Vergleich.
Christian Welzel
- FS III 98-202 Mapping Political Support in the 1990s: A Global Analysis.
Hans-Dieter Klingemann
- FS III 98-203 Remembering the Bad Old Days: Human Rights, Economic Conditions, and Democratic Performance in Transitional Regimes.
Hans-Dieter Klingemann und Richard I. Hofferbert
- FS III 98-204 The Political Culture of Unified Germany
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 99-201 Näherung oder Richtung? Der Theorienstreit der Wahlforschung aus der Sicht politischer Repräsentation.
Christian Welzel und Thomas R. Cusack
- FS III 99-202 Analyzing Democratic Change and Stability: A Human Development Theory of Democracy.
Christian Welzel und Ronald Inglehart
- FS III 99-203 Soziale Integration und politische Institutionen in modernen Gesellschaften.
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 99-204 Die demokratische Gemeinschaft in den USA und in Deutschland.
Dieter Fuchs

- FS III 99-205 Political Consequences of Germany's Mixed-Member System: Personalization at the Grass-Roots?
Hans-Dieter Klingemann und Bernhard Wessels
- FS III 00-201 Structures of diversity of press and broadcasting systems: The institutional context of public communication in Western democracies.
Katrin Voltmer
- FS III 00-202 Ideology-Driven Public Opinion Formation in Europe: The Case of Third Sector Attitudes in Sweden.
Staffan Kumlin
- FS III 00-203 Industrielle Beziehungen in Ostdeutschland: Zwischen Eigensinn und Paternalismus.
Wolfgang Schroeder
- FS III 00-204 Ministerial Bureaucracies as Stand-In Agenda Setters? A Comparative Description.
Kai-Uwe Schnapp
- FS III 00-205 Typen und Indizes demokratischer Regime. Eine Analyse des Präsidialismus- und des Veto-Spieler-Ansatzes.
Dieter Fuchs
- FS III 00-206 Eastward Enlargement of the European Union and the Identity of Europe.
Dieter Fuchs und Hans-Dieter Klingemann

Abteilung 3 "Sozialstruktur und Sozialberichterstattung"

- FS III 95-401 Wie Migranten leben. Lebensbedingungen und soziale Lage der ausländischen Bevölkerung in der Bundesrepublik.
hrsg. von Wolfgang Seifert
- FS III 95-402 Familie und Erwerbsarbeit in der Bundesrepublik. Rückblick, Stand der Forschung und Design einer Lebensformtypologie.
Karin Schulze Buschoff
- FS III 95-403 Erwerbsverläufe in Ostdeutschland. Einflüsse und Folgen.
Horst Berger, Thomas Bulmahn und Wilhelm Hinrichs
- FS III 95-404 Sozialberichterstattung in und für Deutschland - ein Ziel, zwei Wege? Dokumentation einer Arbeitstagung zu „Sozialreport 1994“ - „Datenreport 1994“.
hrsg. von Roland Habich, Wolfgang Zapf und Gunnar Winkler
- FS III 95-406 Developments in Satisfaction Research.
Ruut Veenhoven
- FS III 95-408 Ökologisierung von Lebensstilen. Argumente, Beispiele, Einflußgrößen.
Katrin Gillwald
- FS III 96-401 Mobilität zur sozialen Teilhabe Älterer.
Heidrun Mollenkopf und Pia Flaschenträger
- FS III 96-402 Lebenszufriedenheit im europäischen Vergleich.
Ingeborg Weller
- FS III 96-403 Vereinigungsbilanzen. Die deutsche Einheit im Spiegel der Sozialwissenschaften.
Thomas Bulmahn
- FS III 96-404 Happy Life-Expectancy. A comprehensive measure of quality-of-life in nations.
Ruut Veenhoven
- FS III 96-405 Response Style und Response Set. Eine Längsschnittuntersuchung zu den Zufriedenheits- und Einstellungsfragen im Sozio-ökonomischen Panel.
Jörg-Peter Schröpler

- FS III 96-406 Rethinking Modernization: Legacies of Parsons and Hilbert.
Edward A. Tiryakian
- FS III 96-407 Wohnortwechsel zwischen den Bundesländern im Kontext der Vereinigung.
Wilhelm Hinrichs
- FS III 97-401 Ungleichheits- und Gerechtigkeitsorientierungen in modernen Wohlfahrtsstaaten. Ein Vergleich der Länder Schweden, Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland
Steffen Mau
- FS III 97-402 Die Sozialstruktur der DDR. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion auf der Basis einer 1987 durchgeführten soziologischen Untersuchung
Siegfried Grundmann
- FS III 97-403 Lebensstile und Wohnverhältnisse
Annette Spellerberg
- FS III 97-404 Wohnmobilität und Wohnverhältnisse in West- und Ostdeutschland
Nicole Schneider
- FS III 97-405 Privathaushalte und Haushalten in Ostdeutschland
Annett Schultz
- FS III 97-406 Ein Fall von Car Sharing: Umweltentlastung durch soziale Innovation
Katrin Gillwald
- FS III 97-407 Soziologische Forschung in der DDR. Einige Aspekte der Arbeit des Wissenschaftlichen Rates
Rudi Weidig
- FS III 97-408 Sozialindikatorenforschung in der DDR. Wissenschaftstheoretische, forschungsorganisatorische und institutionelle Aspekte
Horst Berger
- FS III 97-409 Wohnbedingungen und ihre subjektive Wahrnehmung in Ostdeutschland 1990-97
Wilhelm Hinrichs
- FS III 97-410 Arbeitszeiten - Wunsch und Wirklichkeit in Ost- und Westdeutschland
Karin Schulze Buschoff
- FS III 97-411 Ein Suchen und Sichfinden im Gestern und Heute. Verändern die Ostdeutschen ihre Einstellungen und Haltungen zur Demokratie und gesellschaftlichen Mitwirkung?
Eckhard Priller
- FS III 98-401 Inequality and Support for Redistributive Policy: One World of Post-Communism, Two Worlds of Western Capitalism?
Jan Delhey
- FS III 98-402 Über die Möglichkeit einer kontinuierlichen und zügigen Fortsetzung des chinesischen Modernisierungsprozesses
Li Pengcheng
- FS III 98-403 Lebensstile im Zeitvergleich: Typologien für West- und Ostdeutschland 1993 und 1996
Annette Spellerberg und Regina Berger Schmitt
- FS III 98-404 Teilzeitbeschäftigte in Europa. Arbeitsbedingungen, Familienkontext, Motive und subjektive Bewertungen
Karin Schulze Buschoff und Jana Rückert
- FS III 98-405 Das Erwerbsverhalten von Frauen im europäischen Vergleich. Welche Faktoren beeinflussen Arbeitszeiten und Arbeitszeitwünsche?
Karin Schulze Buschoff, Inge Weller und Jana Rückert

- FS III 98-406 Rette sich, wer kann? Die Krise der gesetzlichen Rentenversicherung und die Privatisierung der Altersvorsorge
Thomas Bulmahn
- FS III 98-407 Taking Stock: German Unification as Reflected in the Social Sciences
Thomas Bulmahn
- FS III 99-401 Wohnsuburbanisierung am Beispiel Berlin. Ein Erklärungsrahmen
Wilhelm Hinrichs
- FS III 99-402 Income Dynamics in Three Societies. An investigation of social dynamics using „old“ and „new“ types of social indicators
Zsolt Spéder, Roland Habich
- FS III 99-403 Inequality and Attitudes. Postcommunism, Western Capitalism and Beyond
Jan Delhey
- FS III 99-404 Social Reporting in the 1970s and 1990s
Wolfgang Zapf
- FS III 99-405 New Structures of Inequality. Some Trends of Social Change in Modernized Societies
Heinz-Herbert Noll
- FS III 99-406 Teilzeitarbeit in Schweden, Großbritannien und Deutschland. Individuelle Dynamik und Haushaltskontext im Ländervergleich
Karin Schulze Buschoff unter Mitarbeit von Jana Rückert-John
- FS III 99-407 Komparative und nicht-komparative Ansätze zur Analyse der Europäisierung der Sozialstrukturen
Bernhard Schäfers
- FS III 99-408 Lebensstandard und Armut im vereinten Deutschland
Petra Böhnke, Jan Delhey
- FS III 99-409 Entwicklung der Wohnverhältnisse in Ost- und Westdeutschland
Wilhelm Hinrichs
- FS III 99-410 Demokratieentwicklung und Mitwirkung in Ostdeutschland
Eckhard Priller
- FS III 99-411 Attribute einer lebenswerten Gesellschaft: Freiheit, Wohlstand, Sicherheit und Gerechtigkeit
Thomas Bulmahn
- FS III 99-412 Über die materielle zur inneren Einheit? Wohndslagen und subjektives Wohlbefinden in Ost- und Westdeutschland
Jan Delhey, Petra Böhnke
- FS III 99-413 Poverty in a Multidimensional Perspective. Great Britain and Germany in Comparison
Petra Böhnke, Jan Delhey
- FS III 00-402 Modernity and Happiness. The Case of Germany
Thomas Bulmahn
- FS III 00-403 Understanding Regime Support in New Democracies. Does Politics Really Matter More Than Economics
Jan Delhey, Verena Tobsch

<p>Bitte die nächste Seite beachten! See the following page, please!</p>
--

Die Arbeitspapiere können bestellt werden/The discussion papers can be ordered:

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für
Sozialforschung (WZB)
Pressestelle
Reichpietschufer 50
D-10785 Berlin

Bestellungen von Arbeitspapieren: Briefmarken erbeten

Wir erbitten von allen Bestellern, die Arbeitspapiere vom WZB anfordern, eine **1 DM-Briefmarke pro Papier** als pauschalen Beitrag zu den anfallenden Versandkosten. Besteller aus dem **Ausland** werden gebeten, für jedes bestellte Arbeitspapier einen "Coupon-Réponse International" (internationalen Antwortschein), der auf Postämtern erhältlich ist, beizufügen.

Aus diesem Grund ist es auch nicht mehr möglich, Bestellungen von Arbeitspapier per Telefon oder Fax an das WZB zu richten. Schicken Sie Ihre Bestellungen nur noch schriftlich an die WZB-Pressestelle, und legen Sie neben der entsprechenden Anzahl von Briefmarken weiterhin einen mit Ihrer eigenen Adresse versehenen **Aufkleber** bei.

Die in letzter Zeit erheblich gestiegene Anzahl von Bestellungen sowie die Mittelkürzungen, die öffentlich finanzierten Institutionen - wie auch dem WZB - auferlegt wurden, machen diese Maßnahme unumgänglich. Wir bitten um Verständnis und darum, unbedingt wie beschrieben zu verfahren.

Stamps for Papers

We ask for a 1 DM-postage stamp per paper from all those who wish to order WZB-papers and who live in Germany. These stamps contribute to the shipment costs incurred. All persons interested in WZB-papers from abroad are kindly requested to send one "Coupon-Réponse International" (international reply coupon) for each ordered paper. The coupons can be obtained at your local post office.

The reasons for these measures are the high increase in the number of ordered papers during the last months as well as the cut in funds imposed on publicly financed institutions like the WZB. We do ask for your understanding and hope that you will comply with the above mentioned procedure.